UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/720,150	11/25/2003	Jong Scok Kim	465-1082P	4305	
	7590 03/08/200 ART KOLASCH & BI		EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747			PATEL, RITA RAMESH		
FALLS CHURG	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1746		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO!	NTHS	03/08/2007	ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/08/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/720,150	KIM ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rita R. Patel	1746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	th the correspondence addr	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. poply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this commandoned (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		f :	
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1 2a) ⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b) □ 1 3) □ Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	This action is non-final. wance except for formal matte		nerits is
·	or Exparto Quaylo, 1000 C.D.	. 11, 400 0.0. 210.	
Disposition of Claims		:	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the applicated 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		÷ E	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	drawn nom consideration.	:	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.		:	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		€ :	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.	:	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the col	rrection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	den eniedky veder 2511.00.0	440/-) (-1) (6)	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	1 19(a)-(a) of (1).	
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received	; ·	
Certified copies of the priority docum Certified copies of the priority docum		onlication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	age
application from the International Bu			-30
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		received,	
		:	
Attachment(s)		•	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948))/Mail Date formal Patent Application	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Applicant's Arguments / Amendments

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on 12/11/06. Claims 1-16 have been amended. Claims 17-20 have been added. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. Thus, claims 1-20 are finally rejected for the reasons of record.

Applicant notes that provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections have been made over claims 1, 2, 6, and 11-16 over Application Nos. 10/722,426, 10/722,443, and 10/722,455, however, applicant argues that the Examiner has not made out a prima facie case of obviousness by explaining in detail how the individual claims rejected in the application are obvious and thus not meeting the Examiner's burden of proof. The Office maintains its provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections over said claims, as the Office successfully indicates with more detail herein the claims in the corresponding applications that align with the current application, as well as indicate specific overlapping structural pieces that are taught by each application.

On page 8 of the Remarks, applicant contests that the first fastening member 54 is configured to fasten a bellows 44 to a stationary drum 25 and is not configured to prevent a lip from drooping to prevent an interruption between the lip and the drum as required by independent claims 1, 11, and 17. However, the bellows 44 read on applicant's claims for a lip and thus the fastening member 54 prevents a "lip" from

Art Unit: 1746

drooping and prevents an interruption between the lip and drum by forming these two parts integrally.

Secondly, applicant states that the ribs 69a, 69b, 69c of Kronbetter are all formed on an exterior surface of the first fastening member 54 of bellows 44 and the ribs 69a, 69b, 69c are part of the fastening arrangement that attaches bellows 44 to the tub 40, and as such they are not formed around an entire inner circumference of the bellows 44. It is correctly indicated by the applicant that ribs 69a, 69b, 69c are formed on an exterior surface of the bellows 44 which is affixed to the tub 40. However, the Office maintains that the bellows extend radially about the tub to an extent; in arguendo, if the bellows do not extend completely around the radial surface of the tub, it is still maintained that the bellows extend a significant portion radially about the tub. Extending about the tub is at once envisaged because bellows are known to form a waterproof seal about the tub.

Additionally, in response to applicant's new claim amendments and newly added claims, the ribs 69a, 69b, 69c of the bellow 44 are formed integrally with the tub 40. It is at once envisaged that the ribs of Kronbetter are uniformly shaped about and formed along the entire radial circumference of the bellow 44.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejections over claims 5 and 10 have been overcome due to applicant's amendments made to the claims filed 12/11/06.

Art Unit: 1746

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kronbetter et al. herein referred to as "Kronbetter" (US Patent No. 6,256,823).

Kronbetter teaches a washing machine 10 with housing 12 having an opening 19 in the front of panel 13. Also, there is a bellows 44 in the front panel 13, therein lying stationary drum 25 and rotating drum 30; bellows 44 reads on applicant's claim for a gasket. The drum is tilted horizontally at a 90 degree angle from a traditional vertical orientation for said washing machine. Tilted drum assemblies in washing machines are commonly known in the art, as they provide increased userability in loading and unloading laundry, and are space efficient in that items may be put on top of the washer, such as a laundry basket and detergent containers, or even a stacked type drying machine.

The bellows 44 embodies a first channel 46 having opposing sidewalls 50, terminating in a first and second fastening means 54, 56; the first fastening means 54 has an axially extending rib 65 engageable with one of the sidewalls of the first channel; and second fastening means 56 which has an axially extending rib 70 and is engageable with one of the sidewalls of the second channel and a radially extending lip 80 engageable with the door, whereby the stationary drum is sealed to the front panel of

Art Unit: 1746

the washing machine. Kronbetter's teaching of a first fastening member 54 reads on applicant's claim for a support member. Kronbetter's disclosure of fins 69a, 69b, 69c reads on applicant's claim for a reinforcement rib formed on the support member. As seen in Figure 3, there are a plurality of said reinforcement ribs, fins 69a, 69b, 69c, which are illustratively shown to have a predetermined interval from one another. Moreover, as seen by the depression of fins 69a, 69b, 69c in Figure 3, the fins inherently form a predetermined distance from the inner lateral side of the lip, which is nearly equal to the width of an individual fin. Kronbetter's teaching of axially extending rib 65 reads on applicant's claim for a protrusion formed on an inner lateral side of the lip to be contacted with the tub. The ribs 69a, 69b, 69c of the bellow 44 are formed integrally with the tub 40. It is at once envisaged that the ribs of Kronbetter are uniformly shaped about and formed along the entire radial circumference of the bellow 44.

Moreover, the axially extending rib 65 is formed at a tip of the lip. As seen in Figure 2 of Kronbetter, the protrusion, or axially extending rib 65 is formed at the top and bottom of the washing drum 25, thus reading on applicant's claim wherein the protrusion is plurally formed to leave a predetermined interval from each other.

Moreover, as seen in Figure 2, the axially extending rib 65 is formed at a predetermined distance from the stationary drum 25 and the rotating drum 30. Also diagrammed in Figure 2 of Kronbetter are steps 60, 61 and corner bellow portion 44 which read respectively on applicant's claim for a first plane portion coupled to the cabinet, a

Art Unit: 1746

second plane portion coupled to the tub, and a bending portion connecting the first plane portion to the second plane portion.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Son et al. (US Patent No. 6,584,814) teaches a washing machine with a tilted tub and drum therein; Son teaches said invention is capable of allowing laundry to be easily put into and taken out of the tilted washing tub and also reduces manufacturing costs by allowing one type of casing to be commonly used for the washing machine with the tilted washing tub and a washing machine with a perpendicular washing tub, and which then allows the parts of the washing machine to be easily attached to the washing machine (col. 2, lines 2-10). Kim et al. (US 2004/0025544) teaches a horizontal washing machine with a gasket 30 for preventing water and laundry received in the drum 20 and tub 10 from being leaked outside the tub10 (Paragraph [0045]). As seen in Figure 2 of Kim et al. the gasket creates a sealing path from the door along a straight away then forms a "Z"-shape and follows along a second horizontal straightaway where it connects with the edge of the drum 20, and finally forms a vertical path which connects with the tub 10.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct

Art Unit: 1746

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2 and 11-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 5, 10-12, and 15 of copending Application No. 10/722,426. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a drum type washing machine with a cabinet, drum, tub, and gasket therein; in addition to a support member between the drum and tub for providing sealing means. Copending application 10/722,426 teaches a leakage preventing part which reads on applicant's claim for a gasket, with a ring protrusion protruding towards a center which reads on applicant's claim for a lip extending inwardly in a radial direction.

Claims 1-2 and 11-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 7, and 9-10 of copending Application No. 10/722,443. Although the conflicting claims are not

Art Unit: 1746

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a washing machine including a cabinet, drum, tub, gasket, first, second, and third openings, a gasket, a laundry-stuck preventing part, and a leakage preventing part. Copending application 10/722,443 teaches a leakage preventing part which reads on applicant's claim for a gasket, with a laundry-stuck preventing part extending inwardly in a radial direction which reads on applicant's claim for a lip extending inwardly in a radial direction, and a first, second, and third connecting members read on applicant's claim for a support member configured to prevent the lip from drooping to prevent an interruption between the lip and the drum.

Claims 1-2, 6, and 11-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 9-11 of copending Application No. 10/722,455. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a washing machine including a cabinet, drum, tub, gasket, first, second, and third openings, a leakage preventing part, a deformation preventing part, and a laundry-stuck preventing part. Copending application teaches a gasket with a laundry-stuck extending inwardly in a radial direction which read on applicant's claims for a gasket with a lip extending inwardly in a radial direction, and deformation preventing part reads on applicant's claims for a support member.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita R. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-8701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

rrp

MICHAEL BARR SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER